

because of its unexpected spelling and form, and because our recommended move follows normal priority. We had similarly rejected CAECILIUSIDAE. We still strongly favour our original proposal. Our choice of CAECILIONIDAE was based on priority, ease of pronunciation, ease of spelling, and ease of association with psocid names previously used under CAECILIIDAE. CAECILIONIDAE seems far more euphonious to us than CAECILIAIDAE or CAECILIUSIDAE. Psocids are not particularly widely or popularly discussed animals, the family-group names surrounding CAECILIIDAE have been in a state of flux between 1903 (first use) and 1978 (Mockford's summary of the usage of names), and only a relatively few authors have used this group name in insects; so very few would have to change their ways. We recognise here no special case based on usage or significance or probable confusion to justify not following the nomenclatural principle of priority. We hope our proposal will satisfy the preferences of most current herpetologists and entomologists, particularly specialists on psocids.

In case there are substantial numbers who think that it is too far-fetched to claim that the stem of *Caecilius*, for the purposes of Article 29, can ever be CAECILION-, we reluctantly suggest that *Caecilius* Curtis, 1837, be replaced by a junior synonym; and since we know of no such synonym in the literature, we hereby propose *Caecilonis* (arbitrary combination of letters; gender: masculine), type species *Caecilius fenestratus* Curtis, 1837, as a new replacement name. The stem of this name, for the purposes of Article 29, is CAECILION-. The generic name can only become nomenclaturally valid by the suppression of *Caecilius* Curtis, 1837, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy, and we add a request for the use of the plenary powers to that effect to our original proposals.

A COMMENT ON THE PROPOSAL TO DESIGNATE A NEOTYPE FOR
ADIANTHUS BUCATUS AMEGHINO, 1891 (MAMMALIA) UNDER THE
PLENARY POWERS. Z.N.(S.) 2430
(see vol. 41, p. 56-57)

By Robert M. Schoch (*Division of Science, College of Basic Studies, Boston University, 871 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Mass., 02215 U.S.A.*)

Cifelli & Soria, 1984, propose that a hemimandible (Museo Argentino de Ciencias Naturales, Ameghino Collection no. 1812 = M.A.C.N. no. A1812) be designated the neotype of *Adiantus bucatatus* Ameghino, 1891. They make this proposal explicitly in order to apply the name *Adiantus bucatatus* Ameghino, 1891, to a species different from that to which this name was originally applied. I believe that their arguments and reasoning are of insufficient strength to warrant such a radical move by the Commission.

2. As Cifelli & Soria (1984, p. 56) admit, Ameghino's (1891, p. 134, fig. 31) description and figure of the original type specimen upon which the name *Adiantus bucatatus* is based are adequate to recognise this distinct species and to make the name available. In the course of that original description of *Adiantus bucatatus*, Ameghino also coined the name ADIANTHIDAE Ameghino, 1891, initially including only

the genus *Adianthus*. Furthermore, although the type specimen was probably lost during Ameghino's lifetime, Cifelli & Soria (1984, p. 57) admit that 'it is likely that additional materials pertaining to this species will be recovered when the fauna from which it is derived is better known'. In compliance with Article 75 of the Code, any neotype designated for *Adianthus bucatus* should be consistent with Ameghino's original 1891 description and illustration of the type specimen and, as nearly as practicable, come from the original type locality and geological horizon. Thus, it is logical to wait until more material of *Adianthus bucatus* is collected from the fauna from which it is derived and to designate one such future specimen the neotype.

3. In 1894 Ameghino described, and in 1897 figured, M.A.C.N. no. A1812 as a specimen of *Adianthus bucatus*. M.A.C.N. no. A1812 was collected from a different locality, and probably from a different geological horizon, than the type specimen of *Adianthus bucatus* (Cifelli & Soria, 1984). In the course of describing M.A.C.N. no. A1812 Ameghino, 1894, further diagnosed the family-level taxon ADIANTHIDAE Ameghino, 1891 (type-genus *Adianthus*). Ameghino later (1901) referred to M.A.C.N. no. A1812 in referring other genera and species to the ADIANTHIDAE.

4. Scott, 1910, and Soria, 1981, mistakenly took M.A.C.N. no. A1812 to be the type or neotype of *Adianthus bucatus*. However, Patterson, 1940, and Simpson & Minoprio, 1949, recognised and used Ameghino's original type of *Adianthus bucatus*, as figured and described by Ameghino in 1891, when dealing with this taxon. Thus, workers have not universally applied the name *Adianthus bucatus* to the same species. Sometimes it is applied to the species represented by Ameghino's 1891 original, and presumably lost, type and sometimes to the species represented by M.A.C.N. no. A1812.

5. *Adianthus bucatus* (and thus the ADIANTHIDAE) is usually considered a member of the South American ungulate order Litopterna (Simpson, 1945; Romer, 1966; Savage & Russell, 1983). Cifelli & Soria, 1984, make the otherwise unpublished, and thus to date unsubstantiated, claim that in actuality the original type specimen of *Adianthus bucatus* pertains to a caviomorph rodent, perhaps a dasypsectid or an erethizontid, whereas M.A.C.N. no. A1812 does indeed pertain to a litoptern as presumably do the other taxa that are usually referred to the ADIANTHIDAE. Thus, according to Cifelli & Soria, 1984, *Adianthus bucatus* must be removed from the Litopterna and placed in the Caviomorpha, a new generic and specific name must be coined for M.A.C.N. no. A1812, and a name other than ADIANTHIDAE must be applied to the family-level taxon containing the species represented by M.A.C.N. no. A1812. They argue that following this line of action will upset stability of nomenclature for the family-level taxon containing M.A.C.N. no. A1812, usually referred to as ADIANTHIDAE or ADIANTHINAE, and thus they propose that the name *Adianthus bucatus* be transferred to M.A.C.N. no. A1812 by designating this specimen the neotype of *Adianthus bucatus*.

6. It is unclear why Cifelli & Soria feel that the line of action they propose is in the best interest of nomenclatural stability. As they point out (and see paragraph 4 above), the name *Adianthus bucatus* has been applied to both the species represented by Ameghino's original 1891 type specimen and to the species represented by M.A.C.N. no. A1812. Further, it seems convenient for Cifelli & Soria that the original type specimen of *Adianthus bucatus* has been lost. If the name *Adianthus bucatus* is transferred to the species represented by M.A.C.N. no. A1812, then the species represented by Ameghino's original specimen will be left without a name and eventually will have to be renamed. Either way, a new generic and specific name will have to be proposed for one or the other species.

7. If the claims of Cifelli & Soria that *Adianthus bucatatus* is a caviomorph rodent and M.A.C.N. no. A1812 is a litoptern are substantiated, then transferring the name *Adianthus bucatatus* to M.A.C.N. no. A1812 will merely serve to superficially reify the mistaken notions of certain previous workers that *Adianthus bucatatus* (as based on the original type specimen, as clearly indicated by Ameghino in his original 1891 publication, and not on M.A.C.N. no. A1812) is a litoptern. Yet confusion will remain in the older literature as the name *Adianthus bucatatus* has not been universally applied to only one species. Such confusion cannot simply be cleared up by the designation of M.A.C.N. no. A1812 as the neotype of *Adianthus bucatatus*. A more productive approach would encompass (1) publication of the revisionary work currently in progress (Cifelli & Soria, 1984) demonstrating that *Adianthus bucatatus* (as based on the original type specimen) must be transferred to the Caviomorpha; (2) a published demonstration that M.A.C.N. no. A1812 does indeed pertain to the family-level taxon conceived and referred to by some workers previously as ADIANTHIDAE; (3) publication of a new name for the species represented by M.A.C.N. no. A1812; and (4) application of a family-level name other than ADIANTHIDAE to the family-level taxon containing the species represented by M.A.C.N. no. A1812. At the least, it would seem premature for the Commission to designate M.A.C.N. no. A1812 the neotype of *Adianthus bucatatus* for the reasons given by Cifelli & Soria, 1984, before details of the revisionary work there alluded to are published and subjected to critical appraisal.

REFERENCES

- AMEGHINO, F. 1891. Caracteres diagnósticos de cincuenta especies nuevas de mamíferos fósiles argentinos. *Rev. Argentina Hist. nat.* vol. 1, pp. 129–167.
- 1894. Enumération synoptique des espèces de mammifères fossiles des formations éocènes de Patagonie. *Bol. acad. Nac. Cien. Córdoba* vol. 13, pp. 259–452.
- 1897. Mammifères crétacés de l'Argentine. Deuxième contribution à la connaissance de la faune mammalogique des couches à *Pyrotherium*. *Bol. inst. Geogr. Argentino* vol. 18, pp. 406–521.
- 1901. Notices préliminaires sur des ongulés nouveaux des terrains crétacés de Patagonie. *Bol. acad. Nac. Cien. Córdoba* vol. 16, pp. 349–426.
- CIFELLI, R. L. & SORIA, M. F. 1984. *Adianthus bucatatus* Ameghino, 1891 (Mammalia): proposed designation of a neotype under the plenary powers. *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 41, pt. 1, pp. 56–57.
- PATTERSON, B. 1940. An adianthine litoptern from the Deseado formation of Patagonia. *Geol. ser. Field Mus. nat. Hist.* vol. 8, pp. 13–20.
- ROMER, A. S. 1966. *Vertebrate Paleontology*. 3rd edn. Univ. Chicago Press, Chicago.
- SAVAGE, D. E. & RUSSELL, D. E. 1983. *Mammalian Paleofaunas of the World*. Addison-Wesley Publ. Co., Reading, Massachusetts.
- SCOTT, W. B. 1910. Mammalia of the Santa Cruz beds. Part 1. Litopterna. *Repts. Princeton Univ. Exped. Patagonia* vol. 7(1), pp. 1–156.
- SIMPSON, G. G. 1945. The principles of classification and a classification of mammals. *Bull. Am. Mus. nat. Hist.* vol. 85, pp. 1–350.

SIMPSON, G. G. & MINOPRIO, J. L. 1949. A new adianthine litoptern and associated mammals from a Deseadan faunule in Mendoza, Argentina. *Am. Mus. Novitates* 1434, pp. 1–27.

SORIA, M. F. 1981. Los Litopterna del Colhuehuapense (Oligoceno tardio) de la Argentina. *Rev. Mus. Argentino Cien. nat.* vol. 3, pp. 1–54.

COMMENT ON THE APPLICATION CONCERNING *ATRACTOCERA LATIPES* MEIGEN, 1804.

Z.N.(S.) 2393

(see vol. 41, pp. 83–86. 86–93)

(1) By D. C. Currie (*Department of Entomology, Univeristy of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T8G 2E3*)

I wish to express my support for Dr Crosskey's request for alternative action to Dr Rubtsov's proposed conservation of *Atractocera latipes* Meigen, 1804 in its former, misidentified, sense.

The restriction by Crosskey & Davies, 1972, of the scope of the concept of *latipes* is a proper and necessary first step in the resolution of what is a large and taxonomically difficult species complex. Dr Rubtsov's contention that members of the complex have 'great medical and veterinary importance' is not supported by the literature. Indeed, I am not aware of a control programme ever having been directed against members of this complex. Dr Rubtsov's second contention, that the change of names introduces confusion, seems ill timed, as a new stability has been attained in the 12 years since Crosskey & Davies introduced the change. Only two workers (I. A. Rubtsov and L. Rivosecchi) have persisted in using the name *latipes* in the sense of Edwards, non Meigen, since the name change to *vernum* Macquart was made in 1972. On the other hand, virtually all taxonomic treatments dealing with members of the complex have followed the lead of Crosskey and Davies during the same interval.

In my opinion the action proposed by Dr Rubtsov is retrograde and would only result in unnecessary confusion.

(2) By T. K. Crosby (*Entomology Division, DSIR, Private Bag, Auckland, New Zealand*)

I support the proposal of Crosskey that the specific name *latipes* Meigen, 1804 should be interpreted by reference to the specimen recognized by Crosskey and Davies, 1972, as the holotype of the species. I do not support the proposal of Rubtsov that *latipes* should be interpreted in its former misidentified sense of Edwards, Rubtsov, and Davies.